**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO**

WRIT PETITION No.16241 of 2007

**14.8.2007**

Between:
B.Chinnamma, W/o.Bal Reddy

…Petitioner

And

The District Collector, Mahabubnagar District
And others

…Respondents

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO**
WRIT PETITION No.16241 of 2007

ORDER:

Petitioner is allegedly owner of land admeasuring Acs.7.00 in survey No.255/A and Acs.2.00 in survey No.255/AA situated at Pulgarcherla village of Pangal Mandal in Mahabubnagar District. She claims it to be ancestral property. One Golla Narayana was farm labourer of the son of the petitioner. By proceedings dated 05.2.1987, second respondent waived the debt of Golla Narayana and released him as a bonded labour, under the provisions of Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976. It is alleged that Revenue Inspector visited the land and surveyed an extent of Acs.2.00 of land informing that the same is being done as directed by first respondent. Apprehending she might be dispossessed, petitioner filed the instant writ petition seeking invalidation of the said proceedings.

This Court has heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-T). As rightly pointed out by the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the writ petition is filed on mere apprehension. In paragraph 3 of the affidavit accompanying the writ petition, petitioner states as follows.

> Apart from that, recently the Revenue Inspector visited my lands and measured 2 acres of lands on one side. When my son questioned the action of the revenue officials, they have orally informed that they are doing the same as per the instructions of the first respondent. Even at that stage also, no notice was issued to me and the entire action of the respondents is one-sided in nature. In view of that, at any moment, the revenue authorities may take over the possession of the said land by conducting panchanama even without any prior notice to me.

A bare perusal of the above allegation would show that basis for this writ petition is apprehension. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to admit the writ petition. Be it however observed that for any reason,

petitioner has to be dispossessed from the land, respondents should follow due process of law.

The writ petition, with the above observations, is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

August 14, 2007

NOTE:

Dispatch order copy by 21.8.2007.

(By order)

YS